

**REMARKS**

**I. Status Of The Claims**

Claims 1-87 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nadooshan (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,182) in view of Kumar (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0111457).

With this response claims 1, 22, 43, 64, and 87 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 22, 43, 64, 85, and 87 are independent.

**II. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 22, 43, 64, 85, and 87**

The Office Action rejects independent claims 1, 22, 43, 64, 85, and 87 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nadooshan in view of Kumar.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Nadooshan and Kumar, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... receiving a first message including a first value and a second value ... [and]

dispatching the token in response to receipt of the second message and determination that the second message includes the first value”

as set forth in each of claims 1, 43, and 87 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

As another example, Nadooshan and Kumar, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... dispatching a first message including a first value and a second value ...;

dispatching a second message, wherein the second message includes said first value ...; and

receiving a token ... wherein the token is dispatched in response to receipt of the second message and determination that the second message includes the first value”

as set forth in each of claims 22 and 64 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

The Office Action apparently contends that such is disclosed by Nadooshan, the Office Action apparently equating the “token request message” of Nadooshan with the “first message” of the claims, and apparently equating the “client response message” of Nadooshan with the “second message” of the claims.

However, Nadooshan fails, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest that the “client response message” includes a value that was included in the “token request message,” and instead explains the “client response message” to merely include a “response computed by the client” and a “session identifier”:

“[t]he client 400 responds to the token generating server 300 during step 235 with a client response message containing the response computed by the client 400 to the challenge and a session identifier”  
(see Nadooshan col. 5 ln. 17-20; emphasis added).

Nadooshan fails, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest that the “response computed by the client 400 to the challenge” or the “session identifier” are included in the “token request message.”

As yet another example, Nadooshan and Kumar, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... dispatching, to a predetermined destination, a short

message service message including the random value and some or all of the information; and

dispatching, to the predetermined location, a token request message including the random value”

as set forth in claim 85 (emphasis added).

The Office Action apparently contends that such is disclosed by Nadooshan, the Office Action apparently equating the “token request message” of Nadooshan with the “short message service message” of the claim, and apparently equating the “client response message” of Nadooshan with the “token request message” of the claim.

However, as discussed above, Nadooshan fails, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest that the “client response message” includes a value that was included in the “token request message.”

As a further example, Nadooshan and Kumar, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... determining the storage element to serve as an identification tag for session initiation ...”

as set forth in claim 85.

In view of at least the foregoing Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 22, 43, 64, 85, and 87 at least with the amendments herewith, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

### **III. Dependent Claim Rejections**

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the

independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

*(Continued on next page)*

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4182.

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: November 13, 2006

By:



Angus R. Gill  
Registration No. 51,133

**Mailing Address:**  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, New York 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700  
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)